arXiv:1403.5831v1 [math.CO] 24 Mar 2014

RAMSEY ALGEBRAS

WEN CHEAN TEH

Abstract. Hindman's theorem says that every finite coloring of the natural numbers has a monochromatic set of finite sums. Ramsey algebras are structures that satisfy an analogue of Hindman's theorem. The main purpose of this paper is to introduce Ramsey algebras and to present some basic results of their theory. In particular, we show that every infinite integral domain is not a Ramsey algebra.

1. Introduction

The set of natural numbers $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ is denoted by ω. Suppose $\langle x_i \rangle_{i\in\omega}$ is a sequence of natural numbers. Let $\mathrm{FS}(\langle x_i \rangle_{i\in\omega})$ denote the set $\{ \sum_{i\in F} x_i \mid F \in \mathcal{P}_f(\omega)\backslash\{\varnothing\} \}$, where $\mathcal{P}_f(\omega)$ is the set of all finite subsets of ω. Hindman's Theorem [8] says that for every finite partition of the set of positive natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup \cdots \cup X_N$, there exists a sequence $\langle x_i \rangle_{i\in\omega}$ of positive natural numbers such that for some $0 \leq j \leq N$, we have $\mathrm{FS}(\langle x_i \rangle_{i\in\omega}) \subseteq X_j$. In fact, such a sequence $\langle x_i \rangle_{i\in\omega}$ can be chosen to be a "sum subsystem" of any given sequence $\langle y_i \rangle_{i\in\omega}$ of natural numbers.

To us an algebra is a structure consists of a set together with a collection of operations on the set. A Ramsey algebra is a structure which possesses the property analogous to that possesed by the semigroup $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ as in Hindman's Theorem. The definition of Ramsey algebra is suggested by Carlson [2]. In this paper, we will introduce Ramsey algebras and give some basic results of their theory. At the same time, this author also presents Ramsey algebras in [14] using the notations and terminology commonly used in mathematical logic. For the remaining of this section, we give a historical account and motivation for Ramsey algebras. In addition, we point out the connection between Ramsey algebras and idempotent ultrafilters.

In 1988 Carlson [1] presented an abstract version of Ellentuck's Theorem [5]. He called structures that have properties analogous to those of Ellentuck's space Ramsey spaces. The main objects of study there are certain spaces of infinite sequences of multivariable words. The fact

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 05A17; Secondary 05D10.

Key words and phrases. Ramsey algebra, Hindman'd Theorem, Ramsey space, orderly composition.

that the unary type of these spaces, namely the spaces of infinite sequences of variable words—single variable—are Ramsey (Theorem 2 in [1]) has as corollaries many earlier Ramsey theoretic results including Hindman's Theorem, Ellentuck's Theorem, the dual Ellentuck Theorem [3], the Galvin-Prikry Theorem [6] and the Hales-Jewett Theorem [7]. Since then there has been an active study on Ramsey spaces (see [16]).

Carlson's interesting spaces of infinite sequences of variable words can be associated to some algebras of variable words. Conversely, every algebra induces a space of infinite sequences under the analogous Ellentuck topology. His abstract Ellentuck's Theorem reduces the topological question of whether such a space is Ramsey to a more combinatorial question. The notion of Ramsey algebras is formulated precisely to capture this combinatorial property and hence such a space is Ramsey if and only if the associated algebra is Ramsey. This relation between Ramsey algebras and Ramsey spaces will be addressed in section 6.

Therefore, there are interesting Ramsey algebras of variable words, which are *not* semigroup. The collection of operations in each of these algebras is finite but can be arbitrarily large depending on the size of the underlying finite alphabet. In view of no infinite integral domain—involving two associative binary operations—is a Ramsey algebra (Theorem 5.5 here), there is a nice interplay among the operations in a Ramsey algebra of variable words. This fine interplay allows the construction of certain idempotent ultrafilters, a key feature in Carlson's proof. These ultrafilters in turn allow the construction of sequences with certain homogeneity properties, showing that the corresponding algebra of variable words is Ramsey. This approach generalizes Galvin-Glazer proof (see [4] or [10]) of Hindman's Theorem.

Hindman [9] showed that no ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ is idempotent for addition and multiplication simultaneosly. On the other hand, the ultrafilter constructed in Carlson's proof is idempotent for every operation in the corresponding Ramsey algebra of variable words. Furthermore, this author [15] has shown that assuming Martin's Axiom every nondegenerate Ramsey algebra has a nonprincipal strongly reductible ultrafilter, analogous to the existence of strongly summable ultrafilters under Martin's Axiom [11]. Strongly reductible ultrafilters are necessarily idempotent. Hence, a positive answer to the following open problem, which is due to Carlson [2], is a generalization of the existence of idempotent ultrafilters for a semigroup.

Question 1.1. *Can the existence of idempotent ultrafilters for a Ramsey algebra be proven in* ZFC*?*

2. Preliminaries

To us an *algebra* is a pair $(A, \mathcal{F})$, where A is a nonempty set and $\mathcal{F}$ is a (possibly empty) collection of operations on A, none of which is nullary. If $\mathcal{F}$ is finite, we will write $(A, f_1, \dots, f_n)$ instead of $(A, \{f_1, \dots, f_n\})$. To say that $a \in A$ is an *idempotent* element for an algebra $(A, \mathcal{F})$ means that $f(a, \dots, a) = a$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra and B is a nonempty subset of A. Suppose for each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, the set B is closed under f in the usual sense and we write $f \restriction B$ to denote the restriction of f to B^n with codomain B, provided f is n-ary. The algebra $(B, \{ f \restriction B \mid f \in \mathcal{F} \})$ is called a *subalgebra*[1] of $(A, \mathcal{F})$.

The set of infinite and finite sequences in A are denoted by ${}^{\omega}A$ and ${}^{<\omega}A$ respectively. Suppose $\vec{a}$ is an infinite sequence $\langle a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots \rangle$. For $n \geq 1$, let $\vec{a} \restriction n$ denote the initial segment of $\vec{a}$ of length n, namely $\langle a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$. For $n \in \omega$, let $\vec{a}{-}n$ denote the sequence $\langle a_n, a_{n+1}, a_{n+2}, \dots \rangle$. If $\vec{b}$ is a finite sequence $\langle b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1} \rangle$, then $|\vec{b}|$ is the length of $\vec{b}$, which is n, and the concatenation $\vec{b} * \vec{a}$ of $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{a}$ is $\langle b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}, a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots \rangle$.

A pre-partial ordering on a set A is a binary relation on A which is reflexive and transitive.

If f is an n-ary operation on a set A and $\vec{a}$ is a sequence in A of length n, we will write $f(\vec{a})$ to mean $f(\vec{a}(0), \dots, \vec{a}(n-1))$ for notational convenience.

We will use a symbol with a bar over it to indicate a list.

A set in a topological space has the property of Baire if and only if its symmetric difference with some open set is meager.

3. Ramsey Algebras

Definition 3.1. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra. An operation $f : A^n \to A$ is an *orderly composition* of $\mathcal{F}$ iff there are $g, h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n) = g(h_1(\bar{x}_1), \dots, h_n(\bar{x}_n))$. We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is *closed under orderly composition* iff $f \in \mathcal{F}$ whenever f is an orderly composition of $\mathcal{F}$. The collection of *orderly terms* over $\mathcal{F}$ is the smallest collection of operations on A that contains $\mathcal{F}$ and the identity function on A and is closed under orderly composition.

Equivalently, the collection of orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$ is the collection of operations on A that can be generated by finitely many applications of the following rules:

(1) The identity function on A is an orderly term;

[1]Note that $f \restriction B$ and $g \restriction B$ can be equal when f and g are distinct. Our notions of "algebra" and "subalgebra" are different from but compatible with that in the theory of universal algebra.

(2) Every operation in $\mathcal{F}$ is an orderly term;
(3) If f is given by $f(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n) = g(h_1(\bar{x}_1), \ldots, h_n(\bar{x}_n))$ for some $g \in \mathcal{F}$ and orderly terms $h_1, \ldots, h_n$, then f is an orderly term.

Remark 3.2. The definition of orderly composition is due to Carlson [1]. In fact, Carlson's definition is more general because it is defined for any heterogenoeus algebra, that is, an indexed collection of distinct sets with a collection of operations on it.

Before introducing the notion of reduction, we try to shed some light on orderly composition.

Fix a finite alphabet/set L and a distinct variable v not contained in L. A *variable word* of L is a finite sequence w of elements of $L \cup \{v\}$ such that the variable v occurs at least once in w. Denote the set of variable words of L by W. Assume $w \in W$ and $a \in L \cup \{v\}$. Then $w(a)$ is the result of replacing every occurence of v in w by a. In particular, $w(v) = w$. A particular Ramsey algebra in [1] has the form $(W, \mathcal{F})$ for some $\mathcal{F}$, where an n-ary operation f on W is an orderly term over $\mathcal{F}$ if and only if there exist $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in L \cup \{v\}$ (with v among the list of a_i) such that

$$f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = s_1(a_1) * \cdots * s_n(a_n).$$

Notice that f is composed from the concatenation operation $*$ and the unary functions $w \to w(a)$ for $a \in L$ in some orderly fashion.

The general notion of idempotentness of ultrafilters is not needed in this paper. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that idempotentness of ultrafilters is preserved under orderly composition. In other words, if an ultrafilter is idempotent for a collection of operations $\mathcal{F}$, then it is idempotent for the collection of orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$ (Lemma 3.7 in [1]).

Definition 3.3. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra and $\vec{a}, \vec{b}$ are infinite sequences in A. We say $\vec{a}$ is a *reduction* of $\vec{b}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, and write $\vec{a} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{b}$ iff there are finite sequences $\vec{b}_k$ and orderly terms f_k over $\mathcal{F}$ for all $k \in \omega$ such that $\vec{b}_0 * \vec{b}_1 * \vec{b}_2 * \cdots$ is a subsequence of $\vec{b}$ and $\vec{a}(k) = f_k(\vec{b}_k)$ for all $k \in \omega$.

It is easy to check that $\leq_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a pre-partial ordering on the collection of infinite sequences in A. Our definition of $\leq_{\mathcal{F}}$ is equivalent to a special case of the one given in [1], where the collection of operations contains all projections.

Definition 3.4. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra and $\vec{b}$ is an infinite sequence in A. An element a of A is a *finite reduction* of $\vec{b}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ iff a is equal to $f(\vec{b}_0)$ for some orderly term f over $\mathcal{F}$ and some finite subsequence $\vec{b}_0$ of $\vec{b}$. Define $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{b})$ to be the set of all finite reductions of $\vec{b}$ with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

Definition 3.5. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra. We say that $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey algebra iff for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$ and every $X \subseteq A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{b})$ is either contained in or disjoint from X.

We say that $\vec{b}$ is *homogeneous* for X (with respect to $\mathcal{F}$) if and only if $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{b})$ is either contained in or disjoint from X.

It is easy to see that every subalgebra of a Ramsey algebra is Ramsey.

Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra such that for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$ such that $|\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{b})| = 1$. Then $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is trivially Ramsey, and we say that it is a *degenerate Ramsey algebra*. Note that if $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{a}) = \{c\}$, then c is an idempotent element for $(A, \mathcal{F})$.

The following characterization of finite Ramsey algebras is an unpublished observation by Carlson.

Theorem 3.6 (Carlson)**.** *Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a finite algebra. The following are equivalent:*

(1) $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is Ramsey.
(2) Every subalgebra contains an idempotent element.
(3) $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is degenerate Ramsey.

Proof. (*1* $\Rightarrow$ *2*) Suppose B is a subalgebra. Fix an element $x \in B$. Since the algebra is finite, there is a finite coloring of A such that every element of A gets a unique color. Since $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey algebra, there exists a sequence $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$ such that $\vec{a} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \langle x, x, x \dots \rangle$ and $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{a})$ is monochromatic. By the choice of our coloring, $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{a})$ must consist of a single element, say y. Then y is idempotent with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ and y is in the subalgebra generated by x. It follows that $y \in B$.

(*2* $\Rightarrow$ *3*) Fix $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. By going to a subsequence, we may assume that the sequence $\vec{a}$ is $\langle x, x, x, \dots \rangle$ for some $x \in A$. Choose an idempotent element y from the subalgebra generated by x. Take $\vec{b}$ to be the sequence $\langle y, y, y, \dots \rangle$. Clearly $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$ and $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{b}) = \{y\}$.

(*3* $\Rightarrow$ *1*) Immediate. □

The following is a consequence of Hindman's Theorem.

Theorem 3.7 (see [12, V, §2])**.** *Every semigroup is a Ramsey algebra, and so every group is a Ramsey algebra.*

In fact, the next theorem is a generalization of Theorem 3.7.

Suppose $\mathfrak{A}$ is a groupoid (A, f) and suppose $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. We say that f is *orderly associative* on $\vec{a}$ iff the product $a_{i_0} a_{i_1} \cdots a_{i_n}$ is independent of the bracketing whenever $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots < i_n$.

Theorem 3.8 (Teh [14])**.** *Suppose (A, f) is a groupoid. Suppose for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_f \vec{a}$ such that f is orderly associative on $\vec{b}$. Then (A, f) is a Ramsey algebra.*

We will need the following definition in Section 6.

Definition 3.9. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra and $\vec{a}$ is an infinite sequence in A. We say that $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{a}$ iff for every $X \subseteq A$ and for every $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$, there exists $\vec{c} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{b}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\vec{c})$ is either contained in or disjoint from X.

Observe that an algebra $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is Ramsey if and only if it is Ramsey below $\vec{a}$ for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$.

4. Unary Operations

In this section, we will show that if we begin with a Ramsey algebra for which the operations are non-unary and expand it by adding unary operations, then the expanded algebra is Ramsey if and only if every sequence has as reduction a sequence with a certain fixed points property. As a corollary, we obtain a classification of Ramsey algebras for which the collection of operations are all unary.

Lemma 4.1 (Katetŏv [13])**.** *Suppose A is a set and $f\colon A \to A$ is an operation without fixed points. Then there is a partition $A = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3$ such that $A_i \cap f[A_i] = \varnothing$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, where $f[X] = \{ f(x) \mid x \in X \}$.*

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a collection of unary operations on a set A and $\mathcal{G}$ is a collection of non-unary operations on A. Let $S = \{ a \in A \mid f(a) = a \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F} \}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) $(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey algebra.

(2) For every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$ and that $(A, \mathcal{G})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{b}$.

(3) For every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that

(a) $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$;

(b) for every $X \subseteq A$, there exists $\vec{c} \leq_{\mathcal{G}} \vec{b}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{c})$ is either contained in or disjoint from X.

Proof. (*2* ⇒ *3*) Straightforward.

(*3* ⇒ *1*) Fix $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$ and $X \subseteq A$. Choose $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ according to (*3*). Then we can choose $\vec{c} \leq_{\mathcal{G}} \vec{b}$ homogeneous for X with respect to $\mathcal{G}$. Clearly, $\vec{c} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$. It remains to note that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) = \mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b})$. This is clear because $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$.

(*1* ⇒ *2*) First of all, we define a useful coloring. Let α be a symbol not in A. By the axiom of choice, there exists an operation $g\colon A \cup \{\alpha\} \to A \cup \{\alpha\}$ such that

(1) g does not have a fixed point;
(2) if $x \in S$, then $g(x) = \alpha$; and

(3) if $\alpha \neq x \notin S$, then there exists $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $g(x) = f(x)$.

By Lemma 4.1, there exists a partition $A \cup \{\alpha\} = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3$ such that $B_i \cap g[B_i] = \varnothing$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. This induces a partition $A = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3$ such that for $i = 1, 2, 3$, whenever $x \in A_i \cap S^c$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f(x) \notin A_i$.

It suffices to show that for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$, for $(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{b}$ if and only if $(A, \mathcal{G})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{b}$. We argue by contradiction. Suppose there exists $\vec{a} \in A^{\omega}$ such that for every $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$, we have $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \nsubseteq S$. Fix such an $\vec{a}$. Since $(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey algebra, we can choose $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$, we have $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq A_i$. By assumption on $\vec{a}$, we can choose x such that $x \in \mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \cap S^c$; thus $x \in A_i \cap S^c$. This implies that $f(x) \notin A_i$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$, by our choice of partition. Nevertheless, $f(x)$ is in $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b})$ and hence is in A_i, a contradiction. □

Suppose we begin with a Ramsey algebra for which the operations are non-unary and expand it by adding unary operations. The following corollary characterizes when is the expanded algebra Ramsey.

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose $A, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$, and S are as in Theorem 4.2. Assume $(A, \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey algebra. Then $(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey algebra if and only if for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$.*

Proof. Straightforward by Theorem 4.2. □

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a collection of unary operations on a set A. Let $S = \{ a \in A \mid f(a) = a \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F} \}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey algebra.

(2) For every $a \in A$, there exists $b \in S$ such that $b \in \mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\langle a, a, a, \dots \rangle)$. (In other words, every element in A can be sent to a fixed point by finitely many applications of the unary operations in $\mathcal{F}$.)

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G} = \varnothing$. The empty algebra $(A, \varnothing)$ is trivially Ramsey. Note that $\vec{b} \in {}^{\omega}S$ if and only if $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$.

(1 ⇒ 2) Suppose $a \in A$. By Corollary 4.3, there exists $\vec{b} \in {}^{\omega}S$ such that $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \langle a, a, a, \dots \rangle$. Thus $\vec{b}(0) \in S$ and $\vec{b}(0) \in \mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\langle a, a, a, \dots \rangle)$.

(2 ⇒ 1) The hypothesis implies that for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \in {}^{\omega}S$ such that $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$. Apply Corollary 4.3. □

5. Rings

We do not assume a ring to have a multiplicative identity. By Theorem 3.6, every finite ring is a Ramsey algebra. On the contrary, we

will show that every infinite ring with no zero divisors is not a Ramsey algebra. For this, we need to construct a sequence and a set such that no reduction of the sequence is homogeneous for the set. We will first define monotone polynomials and show that orderly terms are equivalent in rings to these special polynomials. We do this because it is easier to construct the required sequence in the more natural polynomial setting. Fix a list of variables $x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots$. For every nonempty finite sequence $\alpha = \langle i_0, \ldots, i_l \rangle$ of natural numbers, let x^α denote the expression $x_{i_0} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_l}$. If α is strictly increasing, we say that x^α is a monotone monomial. A monotone polynomial is a formal sum of the form $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ such that M is a finite set of strictly increasing, nonempty, finite sequences of natural numbers: a monotone polynomial is a finite sum of monotone monomials. If M is empty, we say that $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ is the zero polynomial. Notice that we may identify $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ with M. We say that the variables appearing in $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ are among $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ if and only if $\alpha(|\alpha| - 1) \leq n$ for all $\alpha \in M$. Let MP_n denote the set of monotone polynomials in $x_0, \ldots, x_n$. Note that $\mathrm{MP}_0 \subseteq \mathrm{MP}_1 \subseteq \mathrm{MP}_2 \subseteq \cdots$.

Suppose $\mathfrak{A}$ is a ring $(A, +, \cdot)$ and suppose $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_n$. Then $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ defines naturally an $(n+1)$-ary operation $f \colon A^{n+1} \to A$ given by $f(a_0, \ldots, a_n) = \sum_{\alpha \in M} (a_0, \ldots, a_n)^\alpha$, where $(a_0, \ldots, a_n)^\alpha = a_{i_0} a_{i_1} \cdots a_{i_l}$ if $\alpha = \langle i_0, \ldots, i_l \rangle$. Since $\mathfrak{A}$ is a ring, the product $a_{i_0} a_{i_1} \cdots a_{i_l}$ is unambiguous and the order of the summation is irrelevant. The zero polynomial evaluates everywhere to the zero element of the ring, denoted by $0_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose $(A, +, \cdot)$ is a ring and $\mathcal{F} = \{+, \cdot\}$. For every orderly term f over $\mathcal{F}$, if f is $(n+1)$-ary, then there exists a monotone polynomial $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ such that*

(1) the variables appearing in $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ are exactly $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n$;
(2) $f(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n) = \sum_{\alpha \in M} (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n)^\alpha$ for all $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n \in A$.

Proof. We will prove by induction on the generation of the orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$. Suppose f is the identity function on A. Then clearly f is equivalent to the monomial x_0. Now, consider the case $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then clearly $+$ is equivalent to the polynomial $x_0 + x_1$ and $\cdot$ is equivalent to the monomial $x_0 x_1$.

Suppose f is given by $f(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) = g(h_1(\bar{x}_1), h_2(\bar{x}_2))$, where h_1 and h_2 are $(m+1)$-ary and $(n+1)$-ary orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$ respectively, and where $g \in \mathcal{F}$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$h_1(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_1} (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m)^\alpha$$

for all $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_m \in A$ for some monotone polynomial $\sum_{\alpha \in M_1} x^\alpha$ such that the variables appearing in it are exactly $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m$. Similarly,

after reindexing the variables,

$$h_2(a_{m+1}, a_{m+2}, \dots, a_{m+n+1}) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_2} (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1})^\alpha$$

for all $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1} \in A$ for some monotone polynomial $\sum_{\alpha \in M_2} x^\alpha$ such that the variables appearing in it are exactly $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_{m+n+1}$.

Case 1. g is the ring addition. Then

$$f(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1}) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_1 \cup M_2} (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1})^\alpha$$

for all $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1} \in A$. (Note that M_1 and M_2 are disjoint.)

Case 2. g is the ring multiplication. Then

$$f(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1}) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_1 * M_2} (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1})^\alpha$$

for all $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{m+n+1} \in A$, where $M_1 * M_2 = \{\alpha_1 * \alpha_2 \mid \alpha_1 \in M_1 \text{ and } \alpha_2 \in M_2\}$.

In either cases, the variables appearing in the corresponding monotone polynomial are exactly $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{m+n+1}$. □

Remark 5.2. The monotone polynomial in Theorem 5.1 can be chosen uniformly. It depends on the path of generation of a given orderly term from the ring operations and not on the specific ring. In other words, it depends on the formation of the associated formal orderly term in the language of rings. The proof then goes by induction on the complexity of the formal orderly term.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose $(A, +, \cdot)$ is an infinite ring without zero divisors. Then we can find a sequence $\langle a_i \rangle_{i \in \omega} \in {}^\omega A$ such that for every $n \in \omega$, whenever $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in N} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_n$ are distinct, we have $\sum_{\alpha \in M} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha \neq \sum_{\alpha \in N} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha$.*

Proof. We will in fact construct a sequence $\langle a_i \rangle_{i \in \omega} \in {}^\omega A$ inductively such that for every $n \in \omega$, whenever $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in N} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_n$ are distinct, we have $\sum_{\alpha \in M} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha \neq \sum_{\alpha \in N} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha$ and if the ring has a multiplicative identity $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we have $\sum_{\alpha \in M} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha \neq \sum_{\alpha \in N} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha + 1_{\mathfrak{A}}$.

Clearly, if $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_0$ then $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha$ is either the zero polynomial or x_0. Simply choose a_0 to be any nonzero element of the ring that is not the multiplicative identity (if there is one). Assume $a_0, \dots, a_n$ have been constructed satisfying the induction hypothesis. Suppose $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in N} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_{n+1}$ are distinct. Let $M' = \{\, \alpha \in M \mid \alpha(|\alpha| - 1) < n + 1 \,\}$ and $M'' = \{\, \alpha \in {}^{<\omega}\omega \mid \alpha * \langle n + 1 \rangle \in M \text{ and } \alpha \neq \langle\ \rangle \,\}$. Let $S_{M'}, S_{M''}, S_{N'}, S_{N''}$ stand for the ring elements $\sum_{\alpha \in M'} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in M''} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha, \sum_{\alpha \in N'} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha$, $\sum_{\alpha \in N''} (a_0, \dots, a_n)^\alpha$ respectively. Using the properties of a ring, we can

see that for $b \in A$

$$\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \begin{cases} S_{M'} + S_{M''}b & \text{if } \langle n+1\rangle \notin M \\ S_{M'} + S_{M''}b + b & \text{if } \langle n+1\rangle \in M \end{cases},$$

$$\sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \begin{cases} S_{N'} + S_{N''}b & \text{if } \langle n+1\rangle \notin N \\ S_{N'} + S_{N''}b + b & \text{if } \langle n+1\rangle \in N \end{cases}.$$

We claim there is at most one $b \in A$ such that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$ and if the ring has a multiplicative identity $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$, there is at most one $b \in A$ such that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha + 1_{\mathfrak{A}}$. To show this, we separate into two cases for clarity.

Case 1. The ring $\mathfrak{A}$ has a multiplicative identity $1_{\mathfrak{A}}$.
It suffices to show that for each $\varepsilon \in \{0_{\mathfrak{A}}, 1_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$, we have $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha + \varepsilon$ for at most one $b \in A$. Fix $\varepsilon \in \{0_{\mathfrak{A}}, 1_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$. Note $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = S_{M'} + (S_{M''} + \varepsilon_M)b$ and $\sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = S_{N'} + (S_{N''} + \varepsilon_N)b$ with $\varepsilon_M, \varepsilon_N \in \{0_{\mathfrak{A}}, 1_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$. If $S_{M''} + \varepsilon_M \neq S_{N''} + \varepsilon_N$, then since the ring has no zero divisors, there is at most one $b \in A$ such that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha + \varepsilon$.

Assume $S_{M''} + \varepsilon_M = S_{N''} + \varepsilon_N$. Then either $S_{M''} = S_{N''}$ or $S_{M''} - S_{N''}$ is a multiplicative identity. By our induction hypothesis, since $\sum_{\alpha\in M''} x^\alpha$, $\sum_{\alpha\in N''} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_n$, we must have $M'' = N''$. It follows that $\varepsilon_M = \varepsilon_N$; hence, $\langle n+1\rangle \in M \leftrightarrow \langle n+1\rangle \in N$. Since $M \neq N$, we must have $M' \neq N'$. By the induction hypothesis again, $S_{M'} \neq S_{N'} + \varepsilon$. Therefore, in fact, $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha \neq \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha + \varepsilon$ for all $b \in A$.

Case 2. The ring $\mathfrak{A}$ does not have a multiplicative identity.
First, we assume $\langle n+1\rangle \in M \leftrightarrow \langle n+1\rangle \in N$. We argue similarly as in case 1. If $S_{M''} \neq S_{N''}$, then there is at most one $b \in A$ such that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$. If $S_{M''} = S_{N''}$, then $M'' = N''$. Since $M \neq N$, we must have $M' \neq N'$; hence, $S_{M'} \neq S_{N'}$. Therefore, $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha \neq \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$ for all $b \in A$.

Now, we may assume $\langle n+1\rangle \in M\backslash N$. Then $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = S_{M'} + S_{M''}b + b$ and $\sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = S_{N'} + S_{N''}b$. Suppose that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$ for distinct b, say $b_1, b_2 \in A$. Then $b_1 - b_2 = (S_{N''} - S_{M''})(b_1 - b_2)$. Since the ring has no zero divisors and $b_1 - b_2 \neq 0_{\mathfrak{A}}$, we can then show algebraically that $S_{N''} - S_{M''}$ is a multiplicative identity, a contradiction. Our claim is proved.

Finally, since the set MP_{n+1} is finite and the ring is infinite, due to our claim, we can choose a_{n+1} so that it avoids the finitely many b such that $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$ or $\sum_{\alpha\in M}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha - \sum_{\alpha\in N}(a_0,\dots,a_n,b)^\alpha$ is a multiplicative identity for some distinct $\sum_{\alpha\in M} x^\alpha$, $\sum_{\alpha\in N} x^\alpha \in \mathrm{MP}_{n+1}$. □

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose $(A, +, \cdot)$ is an infinite ring without zero divisors and suppose $\mathcal{F} = \{+, \cdot\}$. Then we can find a sequence $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$ with the property that $f(\vec{a}_1) + g(\vec{a}_2) \neq f'(\vec{a}'_1) \cdot g'(\vec{a}'_2)$ whenever f, g, f', g' are orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$ and whenever $\vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_2, \vec{a}'_1, \vec{a}'_2$ are finite sequences of proper length such that $\vec{a}_1 * \vec{a}_2$ and $\vec{a}'_1 * \vec{a}'_2$ are finite subsequences of $\vec{a}$.*

Proof. Take $\vec{a}$ to be any sequence $\langle a_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}$ constructed according to Lemma 5.3. Suppose $f, g, f', g', \vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_2, \vec{a}'_1, \vec{a}'_2$ as stated are given. We need to show that $f(\vec{a}_1) + g(\vec{a}_2) \neq f'(\vec{a}'_1) \cdot g'(\vec{a}'_2)$. Say that $\vec{a}_1 = \langle a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_m} \rangle$, $\vec{a}_2 = \langle a_{j_0}, \ldots, a_{j_n} \rangle$, $\vec{a}'_1 = \langle a_{i'_0}, \ldots, a_{i'_s} \rangle$, and $\vec{a}'_2 = \langle a_{j'_0}, \ldots, a_{j'_t} \rangle$. Let $N = \max\{j_n, j'_t\}$. By Lemma 5.1, after reindexing the variables, we have $f(\vec{a}_1) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_f} (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_N)^{\alpha}$ for some monotone polynomial $\sum_{\alpha \in M_f} x^{\alpha}$ such that the variables appearing in $\sum_{\alpha \in M} x^{\alpha}$ are exactly $x_{i_0}, x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_m}$. Similarly, we obtain M_g, $M_{f'}$ and $M_{g'}$. It follows that $f(\vec{a}_1) + g(\vec{a}_2) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_f \cup M_g} (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_N)^{\alpha}$ and $f'(\vec{a}'_1) \cdot g'(\vec{a}'_2) = \sum_{\alpha \in M_{f'} * M_{g'}} (a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_N)^{\alpha}$ where $M_{f'} * M_{g'} = \{\alpha_1 * \alpha_2 \mid \alpha_1 \in M_{f'} \text{ and } \alpha_2 \in M_{g'}\}$. Note that $\sum_{\alpha \in M_f \cup M_g} x^{\alpha}$ and $\sum_{\alpha \in M_{f'} * M_{g'}} x^{\alpha}$ are distinct monotone polynomials. Hence, by our choice of $\vec{a}$, $\sum_{\alpha \in M_f \cup M_g} (a_0, \ldots, a_N)^{\alpha} \neq \sum_{\alpha \in M_{f'} * M_{g'}} (a_0, \ldots, a_N)^{\alpha}$. □

Theorem 5.5. *No infinite ring without zero divisors is a Ramsey algebra. In particular, no infinite integral domain is a Ramsey algebra.*

Proof. Suppose $(A, +, \cdot)$ is an infinite ring without zero divisors and suppose $\mathcal{F} = \{+, \cdot\}$. Choose a sequence $\vec{a}$ as given by Lemma 5.4. Let X be the set of all elements in A of the form $f(\vec{a}_1) + g(\vec{a}_2)$, where f and g are orderly terms over $\mathcal{F}$ and where $\vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_2$ of finite sequences of proper length such that $\vec{a}_1 * \vec{a}_2$ is a finite subsequence of $\vec{a}$. Suppose $\langle b_i \rangle_{i \in \omega} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$. Then $b_0 = f(\vec{a}_1)$ and $b_1 = g(\vec{a}_2)$ for some orderly terms f, g over $\mathcal{F}$ and some finite sequences $\vec{a}_1, \vec{a}_2$ of proper length such that $\vec{a}_1 * \vec{a}_2$ is a finite subsequence of $\vec{a}$. Thus $b_0 + b_1 \in X$. On the other hand, $b_0 \cdot b_1 \notin X$ by the choice of $\vec{a}$. It follows that neither $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\langle b_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}) \subseteq X$ nor $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{F}}(\langle b_i \rangle_{i \in \omega}) \subseteq X^c$. □

Corollary 5.6. *No infinite ring with multiplicative identity having characteristic zero is a Ramsey algebra.*

Proof. If a ring has a multiplicative identity and has characteristic zero, then we can identify $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \times)$ as a subring, and hence as a subalgebra. By Theorem 5.5, $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \times)$ is not a Ramsey algebra. □

There are examples of infinite rings without a multiplicative identity and without zero divisors. The commutative ring $(2\mathbb{Z}, +, \times)$ is a simple example. On the other hand, for each $n \geq 2$ the set of n-by-n real matrices whose last row is zero is an example of such a ring, which is noncommutative.

Example 5.7. The assumption that the ring has no zero divisors in Theorem 5.5 is necessary. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be the infinite direct sum $\oplus_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{F}_2$ of the field of two elements $\mathbb{F}_2 = \{\bar{0}, \bar{1}\}$. Clearly $\mathfrak{A}$ is an infinite ring with zero divisors and zero element $0_{\mathfrak{A}} = (\bar{0}, \bar{0}, \dots)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be $\{+_{\mathfrak{A}}, \cdot_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$. The fact that $\mathfrak{A}$ is a Ramsey algebra will follow if we show that the constant sequence $\vec{0_{\mathfrak{A}}}$ is a reduction of every sequence $\vec{r}$ in $\mathfrak{A}$. Fix $\vec{r}$. By the definition of direct sum, each element of $\mathfrak{A}$ is an infinite tuple such that all but finitely many entries are $\bar{0}$. Suppose the nonzero entries of $\vec{r}(0)$ all appear within the first n entries. By the pigeonhole principle, there are $0 < i_0 < j_0$ such that $\vec{r}(i_0)$ and $\vec{r}(j_0)$ agree on the first n entries. Thus $\vec{r}(0) \cdot_{\mathfrak{A}} (\vec{r}(i_0) +_{\mathfrak{A}} \vec{r}(j_0)) = 0_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Arguing similarly with $\vec{r}(j_0 + 1)$ in place of $\vec{r}(0)$ gives $j_0 + 1 < i_1 < j_1$ such that $\vec{r}(j_0 + 1) \cdot_{\mathfrak{A}} (\vec{r}(i_1) +_{\mathfrak{A}} \vec{r}(j_1)) = 0_{\mathfrak{A}}$. Proceed inductively. Since the operation $f(x, y, z) = x \cdot_{\mathfrak{A}} (y +_{\mathfrak{A}} z)$ is an orderly term over $\mathcal{F} = \{+_{\mathfrak{A}}, \cdot_{\mathfrak{A}}\}$, clearly, $\vec{0_{\mathfrak{A}}}$ is a reduction of $\vec{r}$.

6. Ramsey Spaces

The first abstract definition of Ramsey spaces was introduced by Carlson. Here the definition of Ramsey spaces will be provided with modifications from that in [1] according to our purposes.

Definition 6.1. A *pre-partial order with approximations* $\mathfrak{R}$ is a pair $(R, \leq)$ such that R is a nonempty set of infinite sequences and $\leq$ is a pre-partial order whose domain includes R. If $\vec{a}, \vec{b} \in R$ and $\vec{a} \leq \vec{b}$, then $\vec{a}$ is called a *reduction* of $\vec{b}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{R}$.

Definition 6.2. Suppose $\mathfrak{R}$ is a pre-partial order with approximations $(R, \leq)$. For $n \in \omega$ and $\vec{a} \in R$, define

$$[n, \vec{a}]_{\mathfrak{R}} = \{\, \vec{b} \in R \mid \vec{b} \leq \vec{a} \text{ and } \vec{b} \restriction n = \vec{a} \restriction n \,\}.$$

The *natural topology* on $\mathfrak{R}$ is the topology generated by the sets $[n, \vec{a}]_{\mathfrak{R}}$.

Suppose S is a subset of R. Then obviously $\mathfrak{S} = (S, \leq)$ is a pre-partial order with approximations. The natural topology on $\mathfrak{S}$ is in fact the same as the subspace topology on S induced by the natural topology on $\mathfrak{R}$.

Definition 6.3. Suppose $\mathfrak{R}$ is a pre-partial order with approximations $(R, \leq)$. Assume X is a subset of R. We say that X is *Ramsey* in $\mathfrak{R}$ iff for every $n \in \omega$ and $\vec{a} \in R$, there exists $\vec{b} \in [n, \vec{a}]_{\mathfrak{R}}$ such that $[n, \vec{b}]_{\mathfrak{R}}$ is either contained in or disjoint from X. Assuming the Axiom of Choice, $\mathfrak{R}$ is a *Ramsey space* iff endowed with the natural topology, every set which has the property of Baire is Ramsey.

Here are two particular pre-partial orders with approximations that interest us.

Definition 6.4. Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra. Define $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ to be the pair $({}^{\omega}A, \leq_{\mathcal{F}})$. Define $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{a}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ to be the pair $(\{\, \vec{b} \in {}^{\omega}A \mid \vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a} \,\}, \leq_{\mathcal{F}})$, for $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$.

Note that $\{\, \vec{b} \in {}^{\omega}A \mid \vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a} \,\} = [0, \vec{a}]_{\mathfrak{R}(A,\mathcal{F})}$. Also, $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space if and only if $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{a}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. In fact, the converse can be strengthened to the following proposition, noting that $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ being Ramsey does not imply that $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{a}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is Ramsey.

Proposition 6.5. *Suppose $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is an algebra. Suppose that for every $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$, there exists $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space. Then $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space.*

Proof. Suppose $X \subseteq {}^{\omega}A$ has the property of Baire in the natural topology on $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$. Fix $n \in \omega$ and $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. By the hypothesis, choose $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{a} - n$ such that $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space. Let S be the set $\{\, \vec{a} \restriction n * \vec{s} \mid \vec{s} \leq_{\mathcal{F}} \vec{b} \,\}$ and let $\mathfrak{S}$ be the pre-partial ordering with approximations $(S, \leq_{\mathcal{F}})$. It is easy to verify that the map $\vec{s} \mapsto \vec{a} \restriction n * \vec{s}$ is a homeomorphism between $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ and $\mathfrak{S}$ as topological spaces. Furthermore, X is Ramsey in $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ if and only if $\{\, \vec{a} \restriction n * \vec{s} \mid \vec{s} \in X \,\}$ is Ramsey in $\mathfrak{S}$. Since $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space, so is $\mathfrak{S}$. By elementary topology, we know that $X \cap S$ has the property of Baire in the subspace topology on S induced from the natural topology on $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$, hence in the natural topology on $\mathfrak{S}$. Therefore, there exists $\vec{c} \in S$ such that $[n, \vec{c}]_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is either contained in or disjoint from $X \cap S$. It is easy to see that $\vec{c} \in [n, \vec{a}]_{\mathfrak{R}}$. Since $[n, \vec{c}]_{\mathfrak{R}} = [n, \vec{c}]_{\mathfrak{S}} \subseteq S$, it follows that $[n, \vec{c}]_{\mathfrak{R}}$ is either contained in or disjoint from X. □

Remark 6.6. If $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space, then $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is immediately a Ramsey algebra. (This follows mainly because every subset of A induces a clopen set in $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$.)

As mentioned in the introduction, the abstract Ellentuck's Theorem by Carlson characterizes Ramsey spaces among certain pre-partial orderings with approximations in terms of some combinatorial properties. In the case of $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 6.7 (Carlson)**.** *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite collection of operations on a set A, none of which is unary. Then $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space if and only if $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey algebra.*

Proof. This theorem is a special case of Lemma 4.14 in [1]. □

Similarly, we can show the following, which we state without proof.

Theorem 6.8. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is a finite collection of operations on a set A, none of which is unary, and suppose $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. Then $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{a}}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is a Ramsey space if and only if $(A, \mathcal{F})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{a}$.*

Remark 6.9. The collections $\mathcal{F}$ in the above theorems are restricted to such so that the so called property A1 in the hypothesis of the abstract Ellentuck's Theorem is satisfied, when the theorem is applied on $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$.

The following theorem allows the collection of operations in Theorem 6.7 to be expanded while holding on to the conclusion.

Theorem 6.10. *Suppose $\mathcal{F}$ is any collection of unary operations on a set A and $\mathcal{G}$ is a finite collection of non-unary operations on A. Then $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey space if and only if $(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey algebra.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) By Remark 6.6.

($\Leftarrow$) Fix $\vec{a} \in {}^{\omega}A$. By Theorem 4.2, choose $\vec{b} \leq_{\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G}} \vec{a}$ such that $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$ and that $(A, \mathcal{G})$ is Ramsey below $\vec{b}$. By Theorem 6.8, $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey space. Note that $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ and $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{G})$ are the same pre-partial orders with approximations since $\mathrm{FR}_{\mathcal{G}}(\vec{b}) \subseteq S$. Thus $\mathfrak{R}_{\vec{b}}(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey space. Since $\vec{a}$ is arbitrary, by Proposition 6.5, we conclude that $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$ is a Ramsey space. □

We do not know of an example of a Ramsey algebra $(A, \mathcal{F})$ such that $\mathfrak{R}(A, \mathcal{F})$ is not a Ramsey space. One may start out with a semigroup and try to expand the algebra by adding unary functions (thus destroying property A1, see remark 6.9), hoping that the expanded algebra is still Ramsey, but the corresponding space is not. Theorem 6.10 ensures that this attempt will not succeed.

7. Future Work

Certainly, an eventual classification of Ramsey algebras would be interesting. One immediate direction is to look into the construction of new Ramsey algebras from the known ones. In particular, we hope to address whether the Cartesian product of two Ramsey groupoids is Ramsey. Another direction is to look into the connection between Ramsey algebras and idempotent ultrafilters. This is in view of the Galvin-Glazer proof (see [4] or [10]) of Hindman's Theorem. Using the algebraic structure of $\beta\mathbb{N}$, the Stone-Čech compactification of $\mathbb{N}$, they showed the existence of idempotent ultrafilters (for addition), which was known to Galvin to be sufficent to prove Hindman's Theorem. The author has shown [15] that

under Martin's axiom, every Ramsey algebra has an idempotent ultrafilter. Carlson asked whether the existence of idempotent ultrafilters for a Ramsey algebra can be proven in ZFC.

Acknowledgements

This paper grows out of the author's thesis submitted as a partial fulfilment for the award of PhD to the Ohio State University under the supervision of Timothy Carlson. The definition of Ramsey algebras is due to Carlson. The use of monotone monomials in section 5 was suggested by Carlson. The author would like to thank Carlson for introducing the concept of Ramsey algebras and for his critical insights and comments that lead to the generation of this paper.

References

[1] T. J. Carlson, *Some unifying principles in Ramsey theory*, Discrete Mathematics **68** (1988), 117–169.
[2] T. J. Carlson, personal communication.
[3] T. J. Carlson and S. G. Simpson, *A dual form of Ramsey's theorem*, Adv. in Math. **53** (1984), 265-290.
[4] W. Comfort, *Ultrafilters - some old and some new results*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1977), 417-455.
[5] E. Ellentuck, *A new proof that analytic sets are Ramsey*, J. Symb. Logic **39** (1974), 163-165.
[6] F. Galvin and K. Prickry, *Borel sets and Ramsey's theorem*, J. Symb. Logic **38** (1973), 193-198.
[7] A. W. Hales and R. I. Jewett, *Regularity and positional games*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** (1966), 360-367.
[8] N. Hindman, *Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of* $\mathbb{N}$, J. Combin. Theory (Series A), **17** (1974), 1-11.
[9] N. Hindman, Simultaneous idempotents in $\beta\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$ and finite sums and products in $\mathbb{N}$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 77 (1979), 150-154.
[10] N. Hindman, *Ultrafilters and combinatorial number theory*, in Number Theory Carbondale, M. Nathanson ed., Lecture Notes in Math. **751** (1979), 119-184.
[11] N. Hindman, Summable ultrafilters and finite sums, in Logic and Combinatorics, S. Simpson ed., Contemp. Math. 65 (1987), 263-274.
[12] N. Hindman and D. Strauss, *Algebra in the Stone-Čech Compactification: Theory and Applications*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin (1998).
[13] M. Katetŏv, *A theorem on mappings*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **8** (1967), 431-433.
[14] W. C. Teh, *Ramsey algebras and formal orderly terms*, Notre Dame J. Form. Log. (Revision submitted).
[15] W. C. Teh, *Ramsey algebras and strongly reductible ultrafilters*, Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc. (accepted).

[16] S. Todorcevic, *Introduction to Ramsey Spaces*, Princeton University Press, 2010.

The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 United States
E-mail address: dasmenteh@usm.my